

REMARKS

The remainder of this Amendment is set forth under appropriate subheadings for the convenience of the Examiner

Amendments to the Claims

Claims 21, 40 and 107 have been amended to recite "a lens magnifying an image displayed on the display panel for viewing by a user, wherein the active matrix display panel, the light source and the lens are located on a single optical axis extending a line of sight of the user." Support for these amendments can be found throughout the specification, for example, at page 19, lines 3-26 and page 29, lines 3-16, and in FIGs. 4 and 26. Claims 21, 40 and 107 have been further amended to recite that the active matrix liquid crystal display panel has an active matrix circuit and an array of at least 300,000 pixel electrodes. Support for the array of at least 300,000 pixel electrodes can be found in the specification, for example, on page 6, lines 10-12. As amended, Claim 21 recites "a wireless receiver within the housing for receiving wireless audio-video data." Support for the wireless receiver can be found in the specification, for example, on page 12, lines 8-11 and lines 24-27 and FIG. 60 showing receiver 1965. The limitation of transceiver has been deleted from Claim 107. Certain self-evident typographical errors in Claims 21, 40 and 107 have been corrected.

New Claim 114 has been added. Support for this new claim can be found throughout the specification, for example, on page 5, lines 3-17.

Claims 35 and 39 have been canceled.

No new matter has been added.

Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)**A. Summary of the Rejections**

Claims 21, 23-28, 32-36, 38-40, 42-47, 51-55, 57-58, 87-89, 91-93, 98-99, 101-102 and 104-105 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,485,504 to Ohnsorge ("Ohnsorge"), WO 93/18428 to Spitzer ("Spitzer") and U.S. Patent No.

4,010,322 to Nathanson ("Nathanson"). Claims 29 and 48 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ohnsorge in view of Spitzer and Nathanson, and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,197,332 to Shennib ("Shennib"). Claims 86, 90, 94 and 107 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ohnsorge in view of Spitzer and Nathanson, and further in view of EP 0 551 781 A1 to Suzuki ("Suzuki").

The Examiner states that the cited references, in combination, teach limitations recited in the claims of the application. In particular, with respect to Claims 21, 23-28, 32-36, 38-40, 42-47, 51-55, 57-58, 87-89, 91-93, 98-99, 101-102 and 104-105, the Examiner states that "it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to have used an active matrix liquid crystal [display] of Spitzer for the liquid crystal display [device] of Ohnsorge." The Examiner also states that "it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to have modified Ohnsorge with the features of the power source and lens as taught by Nathanson." With respect to Claims 86, 90, 94 and 107, the Examiner states that "it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to have combined Ohnsorge's wireless audio-video portable display device into a head-mounted display as taught by Spitz," and that "it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to have modified Ohnsorge as modified with the features of the servo as taught by Suzuki."

B. Applicants' Claimed Invention Are Non-obvious in View of Ohnsorge, Spitzer, Nathanson, Shennib and Suzuki

Although Applicants do not agree with the Examiner, Applicants have amended independent Claims 21, 40 and 107 to further distinguish the claimed invention from the cited references and thereby expedite prosecution of the application.

As amended, Applicants' claimed invention of independent Claim 21 is directed to a portable wireless communication device that includes *an active matrix liquid crystal display panel having an active matrix circuit and an array of at least 300,000 pixel electrodes*, a light source, a display driver circuit coupled to the active matrix circuit and a lens for viewing by a user, where *the active matrix liquid display panel, the light source and the lens* are located *on a single optical axis extending along a line of sight of the user*. Independent Claims 40 and 107 also recite these elements and their relationship.

The primary reference, Ohnsorge, discloses a mobile radiotelephone device that employs a flat liquid crystal display (5). However, Ohnsorge does not disclose or suggest a portable communication device as claimed by Applicants. In particular, Ohnsorge does not disclose or suggest a portable communication device that includes an active matrix liquid crystal display panel including an active matrix circuit. Moreover, Ohnsorge does not disclose or suggest a portable communication device that includes an active matrix liquid crystal display panel including an active matrix circuit, a light source for the liquid crystal display panel and a lens for viewing by a user, where all of these are located on a single optical axis extending along a line of sight of the user.

The Examiner cites Spitzer to remedy the deficiencies of Ohnsorge in that Ohnsorge does not teach an active matrix liquid crystal display as claimed by Applicants. However, Spitzer does not disclose or suggest a portable wireless communication device as claimed in the amended claims. In particular, Spitzer does not disclose or suggest a portable wireless device including an active matrix liquid crystal display panel having an active matrix circuit and an array of at least 300,000 pixel electrodes, a light source, a display driver circuit coupled to the active matrix circuit and a lens for viewing by a user, where the active matrix liquid display panel, the light source and the lens are located on a single optical axis extending along a line of sight of the user. Thus, Spitzer does not remedy the deficiencies of Ohnsorge.

The other references cited by the Examiner also do not remedy the deficiencies of Ohnsorge. For example, Nathanson discloses a portable telephone that employs a cathode ray tube. Suzuki discloses a goggle type image display apparatus. Shennib discloses a headset-based hearing tester and hearing aid programming instrument. However, as with Ohnsorge, these secondary references do not disclose or suggest a portable communication device having an active matrix liquid crystal display panel including an active matrix circuit. Further, the secondary references do not disclose or suggest a portable communication device having an active matrix liquid crystal display panel including an active matrix circuit and an array of at least 300,000 pixel electrodes, a light source and a lens that are located on a single optical axis extending along a line of sight of the user, as recited in Applicants' claimed invention. In particular, Suzuki, which discloses a lens, an LCD and a backlight, teaches away from having all the elements (*i.e.*, the lens, the LCD, and the backlight) along a common linear axis with the eye.

Suzuki, as seen in Figure 2, places the display (11) and backlight (12) in a plane with the lens (14) which is generally perpendicular to the common linear axis of the eye and the lens.

In sum, as discussed above, the primary reference, Ohnsorge, does not disclose or suggest such a portable communication device as recited in Applicants' claimed invention. As discussed above, the secondary references, Spitzer, Nathanson, Suzuki and Shennib, do not remedy the deficiencies of Ohnsorge. Therefore, Ohnsorge, Spitzer, Nathanson, Suzuki and Shennib, either separately or in combination, do not teach the claimed invention, as amended, and do not render Applicants' claimed invention of independent Claims 21, 40 and 107 obvious. Claims 23-29, 32-34, 36 and 38 depend from independent Claim 21. Claims 42-48, 51-55, 57-58, 86-93, 98-99, 101-102 and 104-105 depend from independent Claim 40. Therefore, the subject matter of dependent Claims 23-29, 32-34, 36, 42-48, 51-55, 57-58, 86-93, 98-99, 101-102 and 104-105 also is non-obvious in view of Ohnsorge, Spitzer, Nathanson, Suzuki and Shennib, taken either separately or in combination, at least for the aforementioned reasons. Claims 35 and 39 have been canceled. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw these rejections.

Information Disclosure Statement

A Supplemental Information Disclosure Statement (SIDS) is being filed concurrently herewith. Entry of the SIDS is respectfully requested.

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

As discussed above, independent Claims 21, 40 and 107, as currently amended, are not obvious in view of Ohnsorge, Spitzer, Nathanson, Suzuki and Shennib, taken either separately or in combination. Dependent Claims 23-29, 32-34, 36, 42-48, 51-55, 57-58, 86-93, 98-99, 101-102 and 104-105 also are not obvious in view of the cited references. In view of the above amendments and remarks, it is believed that all currently-pending claims are in condition for allowance, and it is respectfully requested that the application be passed to issue. If the Examiner feels that a telephone conference would expedite prosecution of this case, the Examiner is invited to call the undersigned.

Respectfully submitted,

HAMILTON, BROOK, SMITH & REYNOLDS, P.C.

By _____
N. Scott Pierce
Registration No. 34,900
Telephone: (978) 341-0036
Facsimile: (978) 341-0136

Concord, MA 01742-9133
Dated: 6/28/06